ORIGINAL

R. Hance Haney
Executive Director – Federal Regulatory

1020 19th Street NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

202 429 3125
202 293 0561 fax
Email hhaney@qwest.com

Qwest. 🎒

Spirit of Service

November 14, 2002

RECEIVED

NOV 1 4 2002

EX PARTE

Ms. Marlene Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554 STAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMUNICATION STATE OF THE SECTETATIVE

Re: WC Docket No. 02-314 - Application of Qwest

Communications International Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-Region,

InterLATA Service in the States of Colorado,

Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Qwest Communications International Inc. ("Qwest") submits this filing in the referenced proceeding in response to the following question from the Commission staff.

Question: With regard to the "Response to Matrix of Kenneth Wilson," Qwest includes information on a 6/1/00 agreement with SBC that is unclear. Qwest lists the relevant states for this agreement as CO, UT and WA, yet Qwest states that the line sharing form was tiled for state commission approval in CO, ID, MT and WY. Was the line sharing form tiled in UT and WA? In addition, Qwest states that paragraph 4 of the SBC agreement has been filed for approval in the "relevant states." Which states are the relevant states?

Response: There are two separate unrelated documents at issue in this question. The SBC letter agreement, dated June 1, 2000, is a 5-page document only; the line sharing draft document was inadvertently stapled to the SBC letter agreement and was provided to the state commissions in response to discovery requests during the Spring of 2002. Thus, the line

No. of Continuous 3 List ARCOUS Marlene H. Dortch November 14, 2002 Page 2

sharing document has nothing to do with the SBC letter agreement or SBC at all.

In August 2002, Qwest filed the SBC letter agreement in Colorado, Utah, and Washington. These are the "relevant states," meaning that only in these states was an underlying interconnection agreement between Qwest and SBC negotiated, and subsequently filed and approved. SBC does not have an interconnection agreement with Qwest in any other in-region state that has a Section 271 application pending.

The Line sharing document is a draft of what was executed as amendments to interconnection agreements between Qwest and various CLECs operating in Colorado, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. All such line sharing amendments were filed and approved by those state commissions. In summary, there are no line sharing agreements executed by CLECs that have not been filed with the state commissions. These filed line sharing agreements are available for CLECs to "opt" into. Further, line sharing provisions, that were modified and approved via the state workshop process, have been incorporated into Section 9.4 of Qwest's SGATs in each of Qwest's 14 states. Therefore, line sharing is available to other carriers in all states under Section 252(i).

Respectfully submitted,

Hance Haney

cc: E. Yockus

M. Carowitz

G. Remondino

J. Myles

R. Harsch

J. Jewel

P. Baker

c. Post

P. Fahn

B. Smith

D. Sillitil

J. Stanley C. Washburn

S. Vick

S.Oxlev

J. Orchard